

**California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Central Valley Region**

**Irrigated Lands Conditional Waiver Program
Technical Issues Committee**

3 May 2005

MEETING NOTES

MEETING ATTENDEES: Dr. Karl Longley, Board Member – CVRWQCB; Al Brizard, Board Member – CVRWQCB, Bill Croyle, RWQCB, Marshall Lee, CDPR; Orvil McKinnis, Westlands Drainage Coalition; Lenwood Hall, University of Maryland; Bill McKinney, ESVWQC; Stephen Clark, Pacific EcoRisk; Joe McGahan, Westside SJR Watershed Coalition; Bill Thomas, So. San Joaquin WQC; Bill Jennings, DeltaKeeper; G. Fred Lee, G. Fred Lee & Associates; Donald Weston, UC Berkeley; Mike Johnson, UC Davis; Matt Reeve, CDFA; Parry Klassen East SJ WQC; Aaron Ferguson, Sacramento Valley WQC; Wendy Cohen, RWQCB; Diana Messina, RWQCB; Margie Lopez-Read, RWQCB; Eddie Hard, RWQCB; Robert Holmes, RWQCB; Jay Rowan, RWQCB; Allison Kunz, RWQCB, Wendy Stewart, RWQCB; Taro Murano, RWQCB; Amanda Smith, RWQCB; Karen Larsen, RWQCB

TELEPHONE ATTENDEES: Lonnie Wass, RWQCB-F; Alan Cregan, RWQCB-F; Anthony Medrano, RWQCB-F

I. TOXICITY AND TRIGGERS

The discussions on toxicity and triggers focused on the recommendation of the Toxicity Triggers Subcommittee regarding toxicity test triggers for conducting a Toxicity Identification Evaluation (TIE) during the 3 species toxicity tests, draft MRP language to reflect those recommendations and issues raised in the Sediment Toxicity meetings.

The Toxicity Trigger recommendation was presented by Karen Larsen of the CVRWQCB, (power point presentation attached). The recommendation is that the T.I.E. is to be initiated within 48 hours of observing a 50% (or more) reduction in survival (for the invertebrate and fish tests) or growth (for the algae test) compared to the laboratory control. The consensus of the Sub Group was that this 50% trigger could be applied to the algae toxicity texts, as well as fathead minnow and water flea tests. The following questions were posed following the presentation:

- If the control is less than 100% survival, say 90%, then do you look for a 50% reduction from that (40% survival or less)? The answer recommended by the group is 'Yes'.
- What is the appropriate TIE for algae toxicity result? The answer recommended by Karen Larsen was to focus follow-up on toxicity due to organic chemicals (i.e., herbicides) and metals. For organics, Karen recommended solid phase extraction and for metals, extraction with an ion exchange column. Both the un-manipulated and the extracted samples are then tested to determine if toxicity was removed.

There was no disagreement with the TIC that the trigger should be applied, and could also be applied to the algae toxicity test. The next steps will be the review draft language for the MRP, make it available to the public for comment and present it to the Executive Officer for approval. Other comments were that laboratories be included in the public information process and that additional recommendations will need to be made for the steps that need to be taken for tests that are significantly different than control, but still are only marginally different. Bill Thomas reminded that the coalition group MRPPs would also need to be revised, although staff recommendation was that this could be done through an addendum to the Coalition Group MRPPs.

Wendy Cohen then presented the draft revisions to the Coalition Group MRP, which included the 50% trigger to the fathead minnow and water flea toxicity tests. There was some discussion and recommendations that the revisions also include:

- 50% trigger for algae toxicity test as well
- Some changes in the Phase II required analyses for nutrients
- Consideration for different language and timelines in the Communications Reports

If there are any additional recommendations or comments, please forward those to Wendy Cohen at wcohen@waterboards.ca.gov.

Don Weston presented the issues that had been discussed at the first to Sediment Toxicity Subgroups. The Sub Group is formulating recommendations, which include:

- Elimination of the growth endpoint portion as a required element of the sediment toxicity test for the ILP
- Inclusion of some quantity of chemical tests to accompany sediment toxicity tests – a decision tree for which will need to be developed
- Concerns regarding availability of laboratories that can perform quantification of pyrethroids in sediment
- The need to develop recommendations for a sediment toxicity TIE

The Sediment Toxicity Sub Group will continue to meet and will present some recommendations at the 21 June 2005 TIC meeting.

II. SAMPLE CONTAINER STUDY

Joe McGahan from the Westside Water Quality Coalition stated that his coalition was no longer interested in funding the bottle study alternative, and in fact, the monitoring staff had become accustomed to using the Amber Bottles. The Sample Container Study is now dropped.

III. BIOASSESSMENT SUBGROUP STATUS

Jay Rowan from the RWQCB Sacramento Office discussed the status of two Bioassessment studies that could be used to correlate information for bioassessments with chemistry and/or toxicity sample results.

These are the San Joaquin Basin study, which has been conducted utilizing TMDL funding, and an intensive study in the Delta, which has been funded by CDPR. Both studies will be losing funding within a few months, although some data has been generated. There is a possibility of utilizing other studies that are being conducted, such as in Orestimba Creek to provide additional information for utilizing bioassessments in the ILP. A report regarding Regional Board study data and other existing data could provide relevant recommendations in about one year. Tentatively, there will be a meeting scheduled to discuss Bioassessment Recommendations in May 2006.

IV. MANAGEMENT PRACTICES TRACKING STATUS

Wendy Cohen announced that there would be a meeting at 0900, 04 May 2005 to discuss the Management Practice tracking requirements in the Conditional Waiver.

V. NEXT STEPS

The next TIC Meeting will focus on recommendations by the Sediment Toxicity Group, and other brief SubCommittee updates. Other topics discussed were as follows:

- Discussion of Basin Plan Objectives, including Region 5's Objective for Toxicity, which reportedly is worded differently than any other Regional Board Toxicity Objective.
- QA/QC Round Robin Tests for Laboratories involved in analyses for Coalition Groups.
- Artificial Data Workshops, as are being conducted by Larry Walker and Associates at Region 3.
- The formation of a Nutrients SubCommittee, chaired by Bill Thomas
- Identify 'knowledge gaps' that could benefit from additional study

Comments and Questions should be directed to Margie Lopez-Read at (916) 464-46242 or mlopez-read@waterboards.ca.gov